

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 FREDDIE JONES,

Case No. 2:13-CV-268 JCM (NJK)

8 Plaintiff(s),

ORDER

9 v.

10 CAROLYN W. COLVIN, COMMISSIONER
11 OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

12 Defendant(s).

13 Presently before the court are the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Koppe.
14 (Doc. # 27). No objections have been filed even though the deadline for filing objections has
15 passed.

16 Upon reviewing plaintiff Freddie Jones's (hereinafter "plaintiff") motion for reversal or
17 remand, (doc. # 24), and defendant Carolyn W. Colvin's (hereinafter "defendant") cross-motion
18 to affirm, (doc. # 25), Judge Koppe recommended that the former be denied and the latter be
19 granted. (Doc. # 27).

20 This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
21 recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects
22 to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a de novo
23 determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made."
24 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

25 Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at
26 all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149
27 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a
28 magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See United*

1 *States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review
2 employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no
3 objections were made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz.
4 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna–Tapia* as adopting the view that district
5 courts are not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”). Thus, if
6 there is no objection to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, then this court may accept the
7 recommendation without review. *See, e.g., Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting,
8 without review, a magistrate judge’s recommendation to which no objection was filed).

9 Nevertheless, this court finds it appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine
10 whether to adopt the recommendation of the magistrate judge. Upon reviewing the
11 recommendation and underlying briefs, this court finds good cause appears to ADOPT the
12 magistrate judge’s findings in full.

13 Accordingly,

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the report and
15 recommendation of Magistrate Judge Koppe, (doc. # 27), are ADOPTED in their entirety.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for reversal or remand, (doc. # 24),
17 be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant’s cross-motion to affirm, (doc. # 25), be,
19 and the same hereby is, GRANTED. The clerk is instructed to enter judgment accordingly and
20 close the case.

21 DATED October 15, 2014.

22 
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28